## \*\*NO COPY OF THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY BE MADE PRIOR TO 7-17-2014

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

\* 12-CR-130-01-SM

V .

\* March 4, 2014

10:05 a.m.

FREDERICK V. MCMENIMEN, III

\*

## TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEVEN J. MCAULIFFE

## APPEARANCES:

For the Government: William E. Morse, AUSA

U.S. Attorney's Office

For the Defendant: Bjorn R. Lange, Esq.

Federal Defender's Office

Probation: Jennafer McNutt

Jodie Gauvin

Court Reporter: Susan M. Bateman, LCR, RPR, CRR

Official Court Reporter

United States District Court

55 Pleasant Street Concord, NH 03301 (603) 225-1453

## PROCEEDINGS

THE CLERK: Court is in session and has for consideration a hearing on Attorney Bjorn Lange's motion to withdraw in the matter of United States of America versus Frederick McMenimen, case number 12-CR-130-01-SM.

THE COURT: Mr. Lange, you didn't file this motion under seal, did you?

MR. LANGE: I did not.

THE COURT: Are there any matters that are going to come up that the government shouldn't be in here?

MR. LANGE: There may be parts of what we're going to be talking about which are going to be sealed, but generally I'm prepared to do a few portions of this on the record.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MR. LANGE: I'm moving to withdraw because I don't think that Mr. McMenimen has gotten from me what he should have gotten from me. I went back yesterday -- I've spent about 300 hours on this case. I've been appointed for two years -- two years ago I was appointed. I should certainly be ready for trial on March 18th, but I'm not. It's not his fault. It's my fault.

April 1 is the -- early on -- I was appointed in March and he wasn't indicted until October, and I talked with him about submitting the documents which are the subject of the in limine motion. I don't know if you've seen that motion.

THE COURT: I have it, but I'm not sure why that's a problem.

MR. LANGE: Well, it's a problem because I don't think I gave him adequate advice about the implication of submitting those documents to the grand jury. I certainly should have counseled him more than I did about that these records are a business records exception and there needs to be a record keeper and so forth.

THE COURT: But I don't know where that leaves it. It's either admissible, it's not admissible, it's genuine, it's not genuine, whatever.

MR. LANGE: I've spent an awful lot of time trying to follow up on that and subpoena witnesses in support of the documents which may very well not be admissible which would go to the heart of his defense. He was entitled to know before he gave me the documents the grand jury full implication of what I was doing on his behalf, and I don't think --

THE COURT: Again, I had a hard time 1 2 following that. 3 MR. LANGE: He doesn't know the rules of 4 evidence. 5 THE COURT: So what. He doesn't have to. 6 What's the issue? What's the problem? 7 MR. LANGE: The issue is I don't think he was 8 fully advised by me about the ramifications of 9 submitting those documents to the grand jury. If he 10 gets convicted, there's a very real chance there's 11 going to be an obstruction enhancement based on those 12 documents. I played a part in that decision. 13 I can give explanations in terms of why I 14 probably didn't spend as much time with him as I 15 should have in terms of advising him on that point, but the bottom line is he didn't get from me what he 16 17 should have got. 18 And more significantly, more recently I 19 haven't spent the kind of time that I should have 20 spent getting ready for trial. I've invested a lot of 21 time on the motions which he may think are germane but 22 which are not and which -- I mean, I'll go into more 23 detail ex parte in terms of that. 24 It's not something he wanted. It's a 25 decision that I made over about two weeks ago.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
He's consulted with the acting Director of
the Federal Defender Program and has taken up his
concerns with them. I'm not positive what his
position is, if he does want new counsel at this
point, but this is not his motion. This is my motion.
         THE COURT: I have to tell you that reading
it -- trying to read it, trying to figure out what
you're actually trying to say, it struck me that Mr.
Morse is probably on the right track.
         Should you be ready for trial? Yeah, you
should.
        MR. LANGE: Yeah.
         THE COURT: Are you? No. I take you at your
     Why doesn't a little time solve that as opposed
word.
to go back to square one with new counsel on a two
year old case?
         MR. LANGE: I don't think he has a great deal
of confidence in me because I don't think that I've
been sufficiently assertive early on in his
representation.
         THE COURT: It's the eleventh hour. We can't
keep hopping off trains. I mean, we've got to get the
case tried.
        MR. LANGE: He's never had other counsel.
I'm the only assigned lawyer in this case.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
I think the difficulty is the timing of this
        I have tried to work it out with him.
think last fall we had what I thought was a very
productive conversation, but I made representations to
him that I wasn't able to follow up on that I need to
disclose ex parte. I think he wants to address the
Court as well.
         THE COURT: All right. Do you want the
government here, Mr. McMenimen, or not? It's probably
better not to have them --
         THE DEFENDANT: For the first part of it,
it's okay, for the ex parte part, all right, which
I'll read my little brief statement here, it may
become clearer. It's up to you.
         THE COURT: Well, I don't know. I have no
idea what you're going to do so the danger looms
large. I mean, who knows what you're going to say,
you know.
         MR. LANGE: I've read it. I don't think
there's anything there that implicates his defense.
         THE COURT: Okay.
         THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. I appreciate you
giving me the opportunity to speak. I feel it's
necessary for me to speak before you today because of
the tremendous amount of misinformation being reported
```

publicly and communicated to just the parties in this matter. Personal agendas, relationships in the press, media manipulation, should have no part in this case as it has. So I would like this Court to hear directly from me about this important matter in my own words so that no one can speculate on the truth or my agenda.

I would like to start out by saying that
Attorney Lange is a true professional. For him to
come to me with this decision to withdraw I'm sure was
very difficult. Admitting mistakes and looking out
for my best interest came first, and that says a lot.

After reflecting on his decision, listening to all of his reasons and discussing it with my family, I also feel it is best for all.

This was not my decision, and I did not ask
Attorney Lange to withdraw. In fact, it came as quite
a surprise, and I would like to be clear on that as it
does not appear to be what's being told to interested
parties. It is also something that I do not take
lightly.

I know that you and this court have concerns about the delay this will cause. I feel the same way. I in no way want my family to have to continue with this nightmare any longer than necessary. We want to

2.3

start the process of rebuilding our lives when I am found innocent.

I also feel for my friends and associates that have been inconvenienced by this process, and most of all I feel badly for my past clients. They did not ask to be involved in this, and I'm sure it has been just as hard on them. I just want for them to be able to get on with their lives and understand the truth and be comfortable and start the process of healing.

Please allow me to inform this Court on what has gone on behind the scenes as much as I can to avoid the situation. As you will hear, much discussion has been spent on this matter in a very short period of time. If the Court wishes to explore some of the issues ex parte, I would be glad to do so.

There are several issues not in the motion that are discussed prior. This includes several reasons given to me by Attorney Lange that I choose not to discuss here in open court.

As we all know, the budget crisis has created issues in our legal system. Especially in the Public Defender's Office here in New Hampshire. They've lost attorneys, investigators and support staff.

For almost a year I have lobbied for

2.3

co-counsel to help out Attorney Lange with this difficult case. It fell on deaf ears above him due do this crisis.

On the other hand, the prosecution seems to have unlimited resources. It's no wonder they have a high success rate. It's not a level playing field.

And Attorney Lange has not refuted those thoughts.

Almost a year ago I gave Attorney Lange information that would help prove my innocence. I gave him names, information and where to find this proof of innocence and help with my defense. To date, unfortunately, very few of these leads have been followed up on.

When I came back from my diesel therapy trip last summer, I again met with Attorney Lange and in his limited time gave him additional information that would end this case and my nightmare. It was the same information as the spring, plus some more. He has still, unfortunately, not had a chance to follow up on most of them.

At that time he was waiting for my competency hearing in November. Before and after that hearing I again had a brief meeting with Attorney Lange and communicated additional information that could end this case.

In fact, at the end of that hearing in November Attorney Lange stated to this Court, I will be presenting to the Court motions, including motions to dismiss, within a couple of weeks. To date that has not been done.

Jumping ahead. In early February I met with Attorney Lange at his office along with his investigator. Sorry. I don't remember his -- I know his first name was Chase. I don't remember his last name.

We discussed an array of topics. The investigator was brand new to the office and had limited or no knowledge of my case and stated so. It was like starting from scratch.

Again, I was concerned and asked for co-counsel. Attorney Lange strongly suggested I contact the Boston office with that concern. I didn't do so right away. I wanted to see if Attorney Lange was going to be able to level the playing field. Besides, co-counsel was my goal.

Finally, on February 18th I wrote a lengthy letter to Attorney Lange and his superiors in Boston. I was immediately put in touch with Attorney Charles McGinty, who's a superior in Boston or acting chief. He immediately invited me to his office.

Over the next few days we met in person and spoke by phone from Thursday, February 18th, through Monday, February 24th, including over the weekend. That's how seriously they took it.

On Monday, the 24th, Attorney McGinty and Attorney Lange called me for a meeting. Within an hour I drove to Attorney Lange's office and he made me aware of his decision and why.

I was given two choices when I spoke with Mr. McGinty: To seek new counsel or talk to Attorney Lange. I was choosing to go forward with Attorney Lange to expedite the trial until he told me of his decision and all of his reasons.

He told me he had agonized all weekend and not slept much, but he felt badly and had no choice. Some, but not all, of his reasons are in the motion to withdraw.

We sat and discussed this for 45 minutes, and he told me whether I consented or not he was filing a motion to withdraw. He stated I deserved better. I was very surprised, but I appreciated his candor in watching out for my best interests.

I am aware of the prosecution's concerns. I know this delay makes it hard on everyone, and I agree with it but I really have no choice.

2.3

Please also let me remind the Court that the last delay was not caused by the defense. It was requested by the prosecution team to accommodate personal family matters of two persons.

However, the prosecution in its objection brings up one concern that I would like to discuss directly, and that is communication. We have no problem with communication. Attorney Lange and I have never had that problem. There are hundreds of privileged e-mails and calls to back this up. I believe it was taken out of context by the prosecution.

I believe that what Attorney Lange meant was that he felt I needed someone to work with me who could discuss and communicate the choices and concerns that Attorney Lange and I have discussed and his decision to withdraw and all of the reasons, besides what's in the motion, that have caused it. That outside counsel could then act and resolve this case and put us all on a level playing field.

In closing, I thank you for your time. I understand now why Attorney Lange is withdrawing, and it is best for all parties. His continuance would only make further delays.

After further discussion of this matter with

```
1
    other confidants of mine, all agree that it's just not
2
    possible after Attorney Lange's private admissions.
3
    At this point there's no way we could go forward
 4
    together. In fact, I think his withdrawal will
5
    actually expedite the process.
 6
             I'm not upset with Attorney Lange. He is
 7
    looking out for my best interests, and I so appreciate
8
    his professionalism.
9
             I commit to you, as I have on other matters,
10
    that when new counsel is assigned I will dedicate
11
    whatever time is needed to get up to speed and have
12
    them expedite the process.
13
             Time to prepare properly and have the proper
    defense is my right, and I think it's sooner and
14
15
    better for all.
16
             I respectfully submit that to the Court.
17
             THE COURT: Mr. Morse.
18
             MR. MORSE: Your Honor, I'll keep this brief.
19
    I stated the government's position in my objection to
20
    the motion, and I think the Court has focused on my
21
    primary points.
22
             The case has been pending for guite awhile.
    He was indicted 18 months ago. The defense has had
2.3
24
    discovery since several months before indictment.
```

I conducted a reverse proffer with Attorney

25

2.3

Lange in August of 2012. We've gone to the brink of trial on at least a couple of occasions only to have the trial continued.

I know that this case has presented a lot of challenges to Attorney Lange in trying to fashion and put together a defense, and I'm sympathetic to his circumstances. And I want to offer every available and reasonable accommodation to Attorney Lange, but at the same time I don't want to cause any undue further delay.

There are elderly victims in this case. They have been deprived of their life savings by the defendant. They are understandably anxious to see justice done in this case. The events underlying the indictment go back as far as six years now, and no one's memory is going to get any better than it is today.

As for any -- Mr. Lange's position that he should be allowed to withdraw because he gave deficient advice, that advice has already been rendered and it's already been acted upon.

Appointment of new counsel is not going to undue the advice or undue the actions that were taken in reliance on it; nor will it eliminate any post-trial issues the advice may already have created.

```
To the extent Attorney Lange has expressed
1
2
    trouble focusing the defendant on the relevant issues
3
    in the case, there's no assurance that any new counsel
 4
    would be able to do any better. In fact, Mr. Lange,
5
    as the Court is aware, is one of the most experienced
6
    and most effective counsel available in this court to
 7
    indigent clients. He's done well with many, many
8
    difficult clients in the past, and I think --
9
             THE COURT: You know, I'm with you on all of
10
    those issues. I'm not ready. Well, it's nothing to
11
    be proud of, but that's curable by a continuance.
12
             MR. MORSE: Exactly, your Honor. I think all
13
    the issues that Mr. Lange --
14
             THE COURT: Wait. You didn't let me finish.
15
             MR. MORSE: I'm sorry?
16
             THE COURT: But you didn't let me finish.
17
             MR. MORSE: Oh, I'm sorry.
18
             THE COURT: So, you know, I'm with you on all
19
    of those.
20
             He seems to be saying -- I don't see it, but
21
    he seems to be saying, oh, ineffective assistance.
22
             MR. MORSE: Right. But I don't think --
23
             THE COURT: I need to withdraw. I'm not sure
24
    what the ineffective assistance is, but ineffective
25
    assistance seems to be what he's saying. I suppose we
```

have to take that up ex parte.

2.3

MR. MORSE: Well, I discern -- maybe I infer two types of ineffective assistance. One was the advice that was rendered in connection with the production of documents to the grand jury, and one was in connection with his readiness for trial. And I guess my point is that neither of those deficiencies, if there are in fact deficiencies like that, are going to be cured by the appointment of new counsel.

I think that the first issue about producing documents -- you know, the advice that was given in connection with the document production, that's water under the bridge and it can't be undone by new counsel or by a continuance.

But with respect to the second issue about readiness for trial, I think the best way to address that would be by a continuance. Not a long one. I don't think we need a long continuance, but 30 or 60 days should be plenty of time to get this case ready for trial.

I know the defendant hasn't moved for a continuance, but the Court does have the authority to order one under 18 USC Section 3161 because the ends of justice in this case -- the ends of justice will be better served -- the ends of justice served by the

```
1
    granting of a continuance would substantially outweigh
2
    the parties' and the public's interest in a speedy
3
    trial, and that's 3161(c)(7), I believe.
 4
             So for those reasons, your Honor, we oppose
5
    the defendant's request for withdrawal and propose
 6
    that instead the Court grant a short continuance of 30
 7
    to 60 days.
8
             THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Morse.
9
             All right. Should we take up the matters ex
10
    parte? I would ask the courtroom to be cleared then.
11
             (COURTROOM IS CLEARED)
12
             (THIS PORTION OF THE RECORD IS ORDERED SEALED
13
    BY THE COURT)
             (ATTORNEY MORSE RETURNS TO COURTROOM)
14
15
             THE COURT: All right. Mr. Morse, you know,
16
    it's an unfortunate situation. My hands are pretty
17
    much tied. He's not prepared to go to trial. The
18
    defendant is entitled to counsel that's prepared to go
19
    to trial.
20
             Based on our ex parte conversations and based
21
    upon the argument made earlier, I just don't see any
    other basis for a claim that withdrawal is justified
22
23
    at this late date in this prosecution, and I'm not
24
    going to allow withdrawal.
25
             Again, I think I understand the basis.
```

```
1
    don't hear anything other than, I'm not prepared, I
2
    should be prepared. That's curable by a continuance.
3
             I don't think 60 days is going to do it. I'm
 4
    going to give him till August. We'll try it in
5
    August.
 6
             I'm going to appoint co-counsel from the CJA
 7
    panel to assist Mr. Lange and Mr. McMenimen. So I
8
    guess it's -- what is it, an August 19th trial?
9
             THE CLERK: It is.
10
             THE COURT: I don't know what the Speedy
11
    Trial Act implications are.
12
             MR. MORSE: Your Honor, by my calculations 68
13
    days have run under the Speedy Trial Act, but of
    course now all this time would be tolled so --
14
15
             THE COURT: Well, do you have any
16
    disagreement about that, Mr. Lange? It seems to me
17
    that -- you haven't filed a request for a continuance,
18
    but it seems to me it's implicit in that you claim
19
    that you're not prepared and you need more time.
20
             MR. LANGE: Yes, your Honor. I think it is.
21
             THE COURT: All right. Okay. And I
22
    determine that the time between the trial date
23
    scheduled and the newly assigned trial date is not
24
    countable time under the Speedy Trial Act because it's
25
    (a) for the defendant's benefit, (b) at the
```

```
1
    defendant's implicit if not specific request, and it's
2
    necessary to provide the defendant with an adequate
3
    defense under the circumstances.
 4
             Substituting counsel would require at least
5
    another year to try the case, and with the assistance
 6
    of supplemental counsel the case should be ready to
 7
    qo.
8
             MR. MORSE: Your Honor, can I ask the Court
9
    just to make an explicit finding that the ends are
10
    served by the continuance?
             THE COURT: Yes.
11
12
             MR. MORSE: And the need for a speedy trial
13
    outweigh the parties' rights to a speedy trial?
14
             THE COURT: Yes. Granted.
15
             Judy, if you would just make the statutory
16
    finding in that order as well.
17
             THE CLERK: I will.
18
             THE COURT: Okay. All right. Court's
19
    adjourned.
20
             (Conclusion of hearing at 10:50 a.m.)
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	
4	I, Susan M. Bateman, do hereby certify that the
5	foregoing transcript is a true and accurate
6	transcription of the within proceedings, to the best of
7	my knowledge, skill, ability and belief.
8	
9	
10	Submitted: 4-18-14
11	SUSAN M. BATEMAN, LCR, RPR, CRR LICENSED COURT REPORTER, NO. 34
12	STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	